

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to a final *Office Action* mailed on August 10, 2004.

Claims 46-72 are pending in the application. Claims 46-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,349,301 to Mitchell *et al.* (hereinafter "Mitchell") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,751 to Hachiya (hereinafter "Hachiya"). Claims 46-72 are also apparently rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Mitchell in view of U.S. 6,546,390 to Pollack, *et al.* (hereinafter "Pollack"). And claims 46-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *A Classification for User Embodiment in Collaborative Virtual Environments*, Mania, *et al.* (hereinafter "Mania"). Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's rejections and respectfully requests reconsideration of the Application in light of the remarks below.

I. Claims 46-72

According to paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 46-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mitchell in view of Hachiya. However, the paragraphs 6-15 and 18-20 make reference to "Mitchell-Pollack." Accordingly, the arguments below are responsive to a rejection of claims 46-72 as allegedly unpatentable over Mitchell in view of Pollack.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. And the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142.

Mitchell fails to teach or suggest "including force information in a chat message, the force information being configured to cause a haptic sensation to be output when the chat message is delivered to a client machine," as claimed in claim 46. Rather, Mitchell describes a "virtual world environment" (VWE) that comprises objects, such as an avatar or room. Col. 5, lines 13-15, 30. "The object may be enabled to sense a plurality of types of data, e.g., graphic, image, video, text, audio, and force feedback." Col. 5, lines 37-39.

Likewise, Pollack fails to teach or suggest "including force information in a chat message, the force information being configured to cause a haptic sensation to be output when the chat message is delivered to a client machine," as claimed in claim 46. Rather, Pollack discloses "a method and system for evaluating the relevance of an incoming message to a plurality of users." Abstract. Thus, the method as claimed in claim 46 is not taught by Mitchell or Pollack. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 46.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 46 is allowable. Since dependent claims 47-54 depend from claim 46, claims 47-54 are allowable as well for at least the reasons stated herein with reference to claim 46. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 47-54.

II. Claims 18 and 39

Paragraph 7 purports to reject claims 18 and 39 for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1. Claims 18 and 39 were cancelled in a previous amendment. Thus, this rejection is moot.

III. Claim 56, 62, and 68

As in the previously issued non-final Office Action, this final Office Action does not address independent claims 56, 62, and 68. Claims 56, 62, and 68 are allowable for at least the reasons stated herein with reference to claim 46. Since dependent claims 57-61, 63-67, and 69-72 depend from one of independent claims 56, 62, and 68, they are allowable as well. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 56-72.

IV. Claim 55 and 61

According to paragraph 16 of the Office Action, claims 55 and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mitchell in view of Hachiya. Claim 55 depends from claim 46. As stated above, Mitchell fails to teach or suggest "including force information in a chat message, the force information being configured to cause a haptic sensation to be output when the chat message is delivered to a client machine," as claimed in claim 46. Hachiya also fails to teach or suggest "including force information in a chat message, the force

information being configured to cause a haptic sensation to be output when the chat message is delivered to a client machine.” Accordingly, claim 55 is allowable over Mitchell in view of Hachiya.

Claim 61 depends from claim 56. Claim 56 is not addressed in the Office Action. In claim 56, applicant claims a method comprising: “receiving a chat message from a network; extracting force information from the chat message; and generating a first signal associated with the force information.” Mitchell and Hachiya fail to teach or suggest “receiving a chat message from a network; extracting force information from the chat message; and generating a first signal associated with the force information.” Accordingly, claim 56 is allowable over Mitchell in view of Hachiya, and claim 61 is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 55 and 61.

V. Claims 46-72

According to paragraph 21 of the Office Action, claims 46-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Mania in view of Hachiya.

Mania fails to teach or suggest "including force information in a chat message, the force information being configured to cause a haptic sensation to be output when the chat message is delivered to a client machine," as claimed in claim 46. The Office Action cites “Worlds Chat, Body chat, [and] haptic feedback” in Mania as disclosing including force information in a chat message. However, Mania describes Worlds Chat as a 3D graphical chat application. *Mania*, page 5. Mania describes Body chat as an application that supports providing facial animation to an avatar. *Mania*, page 6. With regards to haptic feedback, Mania states that “there is limited support for bodily contact in the existing systems, however, there are many technical as well as social issues to be examined further as this is incorporated in the virtual world.” *Mania*, page 6.

As discussed above, Hachiya also fails to teach or suggest "including force information in a chat message, the force information being configured to cause a haptic sensation to be output when the chat message is delivered to a client machine.” Accordingly, claim 46 is allowable over Mania in view of Hachiya. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 46. Since dependent claims 47-55 depend from claim 46, claims 47-55 are

allowable as well for at least the reasons stated herein with reference to claim 46. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 47-55.


Claims 56, 62, and 68 are allowable for at least the reasons stated herein with reference to claim 46. Since dependent claims 57-61, 63-67, and 69-72 depend from one of independent claims 56, 62, and 68, they are allowable as well. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 56-72.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 46-72 are allowable. A favorable Office Action is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions or suggestions of a nature necessary to expedite the prosecution of the application, or to place the case in condition for allowance, the Examiner is courteously requested to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Alemanni (Reg. No. 47,384)
Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 7, 2005

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101
(336) 607-7311 (voice)
(336) 734-2621 (fax)